IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC. and T-MOBILE US, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:16-cv-00715-JRG-RSP

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

HUAWEI'S NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL EVENTS REGARDING T-MOBILE'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

To further the Court's hearing of T-Mobile's Motion to Dismiss and Huawei's Motion for Special FRAND-Related Case Management Conference, Huawei files this notice to apprise the Court of events in related cases that occurred after the briefing was complete in this case. In its briefing attempting to dismiss Huawei's Complaint for Declaratory Judgment of Compliance with Standard Essential Patent FRAND Obligations in this case, T-Mobile argued:

Huawei now claims that T-Mobile has made "repeated allegations threatening future lawsuits," but in support of that characterization Huawei is only able to point to general statements by T-Mobile expressing dissatisfaction with Huawei's negotiation conduct... Neither of these [FRAND violation] allegations even mentions litigation, let alone suggests that T-Mobile has actually threatened to bring a portfolio FRAND breach of contract action against Huawei.

Dkt. No. 19 at 5. In response, Huawei noted "A real and substantial controversy exists. Notably, T-Mobile does not assert that it lacks standing to sue Huawei for alleged breach of contract; T-Mobile could file such a suit tomorrow if it chose. Similarly, T-Mobile does not represent that it

will decline to assert contract-based defenses in the related patent infringement actions before this Court." Dkt. No. 21 at 2.

After the briefing on the motions was complete, T-Mobile alleged the following "FRAND breach of contract" in its Answer and in its Counterclaims in all four related patent infringement actions:

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Non-Compliance with Licensing Obligation)

Huawei's claims for relief are barred, in whole or in part, by its failure to comply with its obligation to offer to license the Huawei Asserted Patents on FRAND terms, including its refusal to offer licensing terms for each of the Asserted Patents.

* * *

[COUNTERCLAIMS] NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. These Counterclaims arise from Huawei's baseless allegation of infringement of the Huawei Asserted Patents and its assertion of those patents—including by improperly seeking an injunction against T-Mobile—in violation of its binding contractual obligations to the European Telecommunications Standards Institute ("ETSI") to license them on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory ("FRAND") terms.

Civ. No. 2:16-cv-0052 at Dkt. No. 106, pgs. 14, 16; *see also* Civ. No. 2:16-cv-0055 at Dkt. No. 107; Civ. No. 2:16-cv-0056 at Dkt. No. 108; Civ. No. 2:16-cv-0057 at Dkt. No. 106.

Dated: January 31, 2017 Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Thomas H. Reger II

Ruffin Cordell

Texas Bar No. 04820550

cordell@fr.com

Linda Kordziel

DC Bar No. 446386

kordziel@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

Leonard E. Davis

Texas Bar No. 05521600

ldavis@fr.com

Thomas H. Reger II

Texas Bar No. 24032992

reger@fr.com

Carl E. Bruce

Texas Bar No. 24036278

bruce@fr.com

Jane Du

Texas Bar No. 24076355

du@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

1717 Main Street, Suite 5000

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: (214) 747-5070 Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

David Barkan

California Bar No. 160825

barkan@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

500 Arguello Street, Suite 500

Redwood City, CA 94063

TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070 Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF HUAWEI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document has been served on January 31, 2017 to all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3).

/s/ Thomas H. Reger II
Thomas H. Reger II